

**REMARKS**

As a preliminary matter, claim 1 is objected to, for the reason set forth in numbered paragraph one (1) of the Office Action. In response, Applicant amends claim 1, as indicated herein, thereby changing “sate” to “state”.

Also, the drawings are objected to, for the reasons set forth in numbered paragraph two (2) of the Office Action. In response, Applicant amends Figs. 1-3 by labeling these figures as Prior Art.

Claims 1-18 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 2, 3, 5-9, and 13-17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1, 4, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Amari (U.S. Patent No.: 6,107,929). Claims 10, 11, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Amari in view of Chan et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,339,696), hereinafter referred to as Chan.

**§ 103(a) Rejections (Amari) - Claims 1, 4, and 12**

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4, and 12 for the reasons set forth on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. Applicant traverses these rejections at least for the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner essentially admits that Amari does not disclose “a notification means connected to said in-vehicle network for notifying, based on a demand from said monitor means, the abnormality in the state of connection of said onboard device,” as recited in claim 1. The Examiner alleges, however, that “the determination in step S13 as to whether the component is connected (Fig. 6) is functionally equivalent to a demand,

since it makes a determination as to whether or not a device is connected”. In response, Applicant submits that the determination in step S13 of Fig. 6 is not functionally equivalent to a demand from the monitor means, as the determination in Amari could be made based on a periodic transmission of a signal from a connected component. That is, it does not necessarily follow, and Amari does not teach or suggest, that a notifying means would indicate the abnormality in the state of connection of an onboard device, based on a demand from the monitor means. Further, it appears that the Examiner has used impermissible hindsight reasoning in concluding that step S13 is functionally equivalent to the above-quoted limitation of claim 1, as nowhere does Amari even mention this limitation. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Amari.

Applicant submits that independent claim 12 is patentable at least for reasons similar to those set forth above for claim 1, as claim 12 recites limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant submits that dependent claim 4 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 1.

§ 103(a) Rejections (Amari / Chan) - Claims 10, 11, and 18

The Examiner rejects claims 10, 11, and 18 for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. Applicant submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 12. Chan does not make up for the deficiencies of Amari.

Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims, 10, 11, and 18 are patentable over the applied references.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. APPLN. NO.: 10/069,397

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q68648

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 10, 2004